

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

ETHICON LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

IPR2018-01248  
U.S. Patent No. 8,479,969

---

**DECLARATION OF DR. SHORYA AWTAR**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PRIORITY DATE AND LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	2
III. QUALIFICATIONS .....	3
IV. RELEVANT LEGAL STANDARDS .....	4
V. OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNOLOGY DISCLOSED IN THE 969 PATENT .....	6
VI. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE 969 PATENT .....	17
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	17
VIII. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART CITED BY PETITIONER .....	18
A. Ex. 1006, Prisco (U.S. Patent No. 8,545,515).....	18
1. Prisco Discloses Cable “Pull-Pull” and Drive Rod “Push-Pull” Grip Mechanisms, Which Are Two Distinct Grip Mechanisms .....	26
2. Prisco’s Shaft Roll Mechanism Does Not Apply a Control Motion to a Selectively Movable Component of the End Effector.....	31
B. Ex. 1007, Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 6,817,974).....	33
C. Ex. 1008, Wallace (U.S. Patent No. 6,699,235) .....	42
D. Ex. 1009, Tierney (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,181) .....	45
IX. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT PRISCO ANTICIPATES CLAIMS 24-26 OR THAT PRISCO IN	

COMBINATION WITH ANY OF THE REMAINING PRIOR ART REFERENCES RENDERS OBVIOUS CLAIMS 24-26 .....	47
A. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That Prisco Discloses All Limitations Of Claims 24-26, Arranged As In The Claim, and a POSITA Would Not Have At Once Envisioned Such An Arrangement (Ground 1).....	49
1. Petitioner’s First Alternative Fails Because Prisco Does Not Disclose Combining the Drive Rod “Push-Pull” Embodiment With Cooper’s Articulating Wrist Mechanism.....	51
2. Petitioner’s Second Alternative Relying On Shaft Roll Gear 742 Fails Because It Does Not Disclose The Claimed Gear-Driven Portion In Operable Communication With A Selectively Movable Component And Associated Transmission Assembly .....	60
B. Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That Prisco in View of Cooper, Tierney, or Wallace Renders the Challenged Claims Obvious (Grounds 2-4) .....	62
X. JURAT .....	68

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Dr. Shorya Awtar. I have been retained by counsel for Patent Owner Ethicon LLC (“Ethicon”) in the above captioned *inter partes* review to consult with counsel, review documents, form opinions, prepare expert declarations, and be available to testify as to my opinions.

2. I understand that Petitioner Intuitive Surgical, Inc. (“Intuitive”) has asserted that claims 24-26 of U.S. Patent No. 8,479,969 (the “969 Patent”) are invalid as obvious. I have been asked to give expert opinions and testimony related to the issue of the validity of claims 24-26 of the 969 Patent,<sup>1</sup> including the background of the technology at issue, and the scope and content of the prior art.

3. My opinions are based on reviewing the Petition, Dr. Knodel’s declaration (Ex. 1003), the Patent Owner Response, the transcripts of Dr. Knodel’s depositions, and the relevant portions of all exhibits cited in any of the foregoing documents and this declaration.

4. The opinions I have formed as explained herein are informed by and based on my consideration of the documents listed above, as well as my own knowledge and experience based upon my work in the relevant field of technology,

---

<sup>1</sup> I understand that challenged claim 23, which relates to Petitioner’s Grounds 1-3, has been disclaimed. *See* Ex. 2002.

as discussed below. All statements made herein of my own knowledge are true, and all statements made herein based on information and belief are believed to be true. Although I am being compensated for my time in preparing this declaration, the opinions articulated herein are my own, and I have no stake in the outcome of this proceeding or any related litigation or administrative proceedings. My study is ongoing, and I may supplement or amend these opinions based on the production of additional evidence, as a result of further analysis, or in rebuttal to positions subsequently taken by Intuitive and/or Dr. Knodel.

## **II. PRIORITY DATE AND LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART**

5. I have been asked to assume that the priority date of the claims of the 969 Patent is May 27, 2011. I understand that Intuitive's expert, Dr. Knodel, has also utilized a priority date of May 27, 2011 in his analysis. *See* Ex. 1003 at ¶¶ 29-31. I reserve the right to address the priority date of the claims of the 969 Patent should Intuitive subsequently contest this issue.

6. I understand that Dr. Knodel has opined that a person of ordinary skill in the art for the 969 Patent would include someone who had the equivalent of a Bachelor's degree or higher in mechanical engineering with at least 3 years working experience in the design of comparable surgical devices. Ex. 1003 at ¶¶ 25-26. While I generally agree with the level of education and type of work experience proposed by Dr. Knodel, I note that a person of ordinary skill in the art

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.